

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on March 13, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-3 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-3 remain pending in this application.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Applicant has amended each of claims 1-3 and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejections.

§101 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 2 to clarify the patentable subject matter. Consideration of this amendment and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Kanai (U.S. Publication 2004/0205006; hereinafter "Kanai").

With regard to claim 1, Applicant has amended the claim to clarify the claim. Claim 1 as amended now more clearly provides that the two or more different systems are software systems. This is in contrast to two or more physical computing systems (i.e., devices). Claim 1 has been further amended to specify that a transaction includes one transaction identifier and two or more associated key values.

With regard to the cited portions of Kanai there is described an online hotel reservation system. The client computer 3, transaction management computer 1, and the shop computer 2 are separate physical computing systems. However, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the client computer 3, transaction management computer 1, and the shop computer 2 are pieces of a single software system that operate cooperatively to generate hotel reservations.

In contrast, claim 1 as amended is directed toward a method that brings together documentation from different software systems, not different physical computing devices. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Kanai fails to teach or suggest two or more different software systems as is presently claimed in amended claim 1.

Additionally, the method of claim 1 is a method of receiving documents and/or data related to a transaction into a data storage system. The method of claim 1 determines if the data is associated with a transaction that already exists in the system by doing a key value look up to obtain a transaction identifier. As amended, claim 1 provides that a transaction can have two or more associated key values. The transaction identifier is then used to index the documents and/or data related to the identified transaction. Thus, for example, if two documents are received that are related to a single transaction, yet have different key values within them, the two documents may still be identified and indexed as associated with the same transaction.

The Office Action asserts that the identity of the shop computer is a key value. Even if this is true, claim 1 as amended includes two or more key values associated with a transaction. Thus, Kanai further fails to teach or suggest two or more key values associated with a transaction.

Further, although the Office Action states in the paragraph beginning on the bottom of page 3 that Kanai teaches “using the key value to look up a transaction identifier associated with the transaction. . .” Applicant is unable to find such a teaching.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the amendment to claim 1 and allowance of the claim.

With regard to claim 2, Applicant has amended the claim to specify that “data associated with a single transaction and stored in each of the transaction specification database, the life cycle Index table, the archive database, and the log detail database.” Applicant respectfully submits that Kanai does not teach or suggest the database arrangement as claimed in amended claim 2.

With regard to claim 3, Applicant has amended the claim to specify that there are two key values. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment places the claim in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6977 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

JENNIFER AMYS ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(612) 373-6902

Date

7/13/06

By



Richard E. Billion

Reg. No. 32,836

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 13 day of July 2006.

Name

John D. Gustaf Marshall

Signature

